

OPINION 2247 (Case 3456)***Nerita helicina* Brocchi, 1814 (currently *Euspira helicina*; Mollusca, Gastropoda, NATICIDAE): specific name conserved by the designation of a neotype**

Abstract. The Commission has conserved the current usage of the name *Euspira helicina* (Brocchi, 1814) for a species of naticine gastropod from the Pliocene of Piacenza area, Italy by setting aside previous type fixations and designating a neotype.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; NATICIDAE; *Euspira helicina*; *Tectonatica prietoi*; naticine gastropod; Pliocene; Piacenza area, Italy.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that all previous type fixations for the name *Nerita helicina* Brocchi, 1814 are set aside and the specimen i 4680 in Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Milano (MSNM) is hereby designated as the neotype.
- (2) The name *helicina* Brocchi, 1814, as published in the binomen *Nerita helicina* and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3456

An application to conserve the current usage of the name *Euspira helicina* (Brocchi, 1814) for a species of naticine gastropod from the Pliocene of Piacenza area, Italy, was received from Luca Pedriali (*San Martino, Ferrara, Italy*) and Elio Robba (*Dipartimento di Scienze Geologiche e Geotecnologie, Università degli Studi di Milano Bicocca, Milan, Italy*) on 14 March 2008. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 65: 173–177 (September 2008). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments were received on this case.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 2009 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 65: 175. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2009 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 23: Alonso-Zarazaga, Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Lim, Minelli, Pape, Papp, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Winston, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative votes – 4: Fautin, Kojima, Kottelat and Ng.

Pyle was on leave of absence.

Voting AGAINST, Fautin said that the glossary stipulates that a neotype is to be designated when 'no name-bearing type is believed to be extant,' but that is not the

situation described by the authors. The case seems to be that the lectotype selected from among syntypes of more than one species was a specimen of the ‘wrong’ species. She felt that the most straightforward solution would be to request that the lectotype designation be set aside, and once it is, the authors could select a specimen of the other species from among the syntypes to be the lectotype. Kojima, voting AGAINST, said the proposal should have requested suppression of the inadvertent lectotype designation by Rossi Ronchetti (1955), followed by publication of the new lectotype designation in the case or elsewhere (which would not need to be authorised by the Commission). Also voting AGAINST, Kottelat said that the application was missing a demonstration that Rossi Ronchetti (1955) effectively designated a lectotype by inference of a holotype. Inference of a holotype implies that s/he believed that the species was based on a single specimen. Kottelat said that he could not examine Rossi Ronchetti’s text, but if he understood the application correctly, the box with four specimens was examined by Rossi Ronchetti. If so, two possibilities exist. First, Rossi Ronchetti considered that the specimens were all part of the type series and then his/her mention of a holotype is not a lectotype designation, and a lectotype can still be designated from among the syntypes. Alternatively, Rossi Ronchetti explained the reason s/he considered only one specimen to be part of the type series and this information is missing in the case. Ng, explained his vote AGAINST, saying that although the arguments were valid, the taxonomic history of the species was not treated as well as it should have been. He wanted to know, would a switch of names cause that many problems – even if one species is less common than the other? Since the identity of the lectotype designated is now clearly known, then what possible future confusion is there? Does it mean that what is now known under the name *helicina* needs a new replacement name or is there another well known name as well? These questions compelled him to vote against the case in its current form.

Original reference

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

helicina, *Nerita*, Brocchi, 1814, *Conchiologia fossile subapennina*, vol. 2, Stamperia Reale, Milano, p. 297.